

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-25 are pending in the referenced application. Claims 1 and 16 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 16.

Drawings

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to indicate whether the drawings in the referenced application are acceptable.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1, for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully assert that (i) a debugging controller; (ii) the phrase “execution mode of a server”; (iii) request player; (iv) replay request; (v) the phrase “modification of requests”; (vi) the phrase “wherein the execution mode is normal”; (vii) the phrase “wherein the execution mode is debugging”; and (viii) the phrase “a debugging controller determining the execution mode using information gathered” are adequately enabled in the specification. Specifically, Applicants direct the Examiner’s attention to the following paragraphs in the instant specification [0061]-[0063], [0073], [0074], [0076], [0080]-[0082], [0084], [0086], [0088], [0089], [0091], and [0092] for a detailed discussion of the aforementioned components of the invention.

In view of the above, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 1 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,804,814 (“Ayers”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants note that while only claim 1 is stated as being rejected, that the body of the rejection addresses claims 1-25. Accordingly, the aforementioned rejection is believed to address all 25 pending claims and, thus, has been treated as such.

Turning to the rejection, in order for Ayers to render the pending claims as obvious, Ayers is required to teach or suggest all the limitations recited in the claims. The Applicant respectfully asserts that Ayers fails to teach all the limitations recited in the claims.

Specifically, Ayers is directed toward instrumenting a target program (*i.e.*, placing probes in various places within the target program) and then executing the program to obtain execution trace data. The execution trace data is obtained when a probe is encountered during the execution of the program. In particular, when the probe is encountered during the execution of the program, the probe is executed to obtain certain execution trace data. Thus, Ayers is not concerned with collecting data from messages passed between two different systems. Rather, Ayers is only concerned with collecting program execution data of a program executing on a single machine.

Turning to the independent claims 1 and 16, in view of the above, Ayers fails to teach at least the following limitations:

- (i) A data collector collecting data from HTTP requests sent by the client to the server and HTTP responses sent by the server to the client – independent claim 1 requires the presence of at least two systems (*i.e.*, a client and a server) which are

communicating with each other (*i.e.*, HTTP requests and HTTP responses). As discussed above, Ayers is only concerned about tracing a program on a *single* system with no teaching or suggestion of collecting data passed between two different systems;

- (ii) A graphical display that includes functionality to allow a user to specify a prior HTTP request – while Ayers teaches that a system that allows an instrumented program to be traced forward and backwards, there is no teaching or suggestion of specifying a message (*i.e.*, an HTTP request) previously sent to the system from a source external to the system (*i.e.*, sent from the client to the server). Rather, Ayers is only concerned with the ability to re-execute instructions of the instrumented program executing on the system; and
- (iii) A request player that includes functionality to modify a replay request using data associated with the prior HTTP request – as discussed above, Ayers does not teach or suggest any mechanism for specifying a message previously sent to the system from a remote system. It follows that because Ayers does not teach any functionality to specify the aforementioned message, Ayers cannot teach or suggest using data associated with aforementioned message to modify a request.

In view of the above, independent claims 1 and 16 are patentable over Ayers. Dependent claims are patentable over Ayers from at least the same reasons as independent claims 1 and 16. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants believe this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 16159/005001).

Dated: October 11, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert P. Lord

Robert P. Lord
Registration No.: 46,479
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicants